

DAILY BULLETIN

JANUARY 28, 2005

USTR ZOELICK SEEKING TO PRESS TRADE PROGRESS AT DAVOS MEETINGS

Also schedules meeting with Russian minister on WTO
accession..... 1

DONORS, RECIPIENTS SHOULD DEMAND MORE AID RESULTS, OFFICIAL SAYS

Lack of measurable results stifling development,
Treasury's Taylor adds 3

STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS CONVEYS PRESIDENTIAL AGENDA, VISION

Millions expected to watch Bush deliver traditional
presidential address 5

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS CENSURE SUDAN ON CONTINUED VIOLENCE IN DARFUR

Following visit to region, congressional delegation calls
for sanctions..... 6

RICE BEGINS TENURE AT STATE, AFFIRMS BUSH AGENDA

Calls on State Department to lead efforts to spread
freedom, liberty 7

USTR ZOELICK SEEKING TO PRESS TRADE PROGRESS AT DAVOS MEETINGS

Also schedules meeting with Russian minister on
WTO accession

U.S. Trade Representative Robert Zoellick says he
hopes to use informal meetings on the side of the
World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, to
give new impetus to World Trade Organization (WTO)
negotiations.

A January 27 press release from the Office of the U.S.
Trade Representative (USTR) says that Zoellick will
be attending the Davos forum January 28-30.

Zoellick said in the release that his meetings with for-
eign government leaders in Davos provide an opportu-
nity to discuss how to advance the WTO negotiations,
formally called the Doha Development Agenda, from
the July 2004 framework agreement reached in Geneva
through December's scheduled WTO ministers' meet-
ing in Hong Kong.

"Much hard work remains if we are to realize the
promise of Doha," Zoellick said. "We must continue
to clear away the remaining underbrush and focus
on reaching ambitious and achievable benchmarks
among the three core areas of agriculture, goods and
services."

At Davos, Zoellick is scheduled to meet with lead-
ers from Australia, Israel, India, Germany, Indonesia,
Malaysia and Brazil.

After the Davos meetings, Zoellick is scheduled to meet January 31 in Zurich with the trade minister of Russia to discuss that country's pending accession to the WTO.

Following is the text of the press release:

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

Executive Office of the President
Washington, D.C. 20508

For Immediate Release: January 27, 2005

USTR Zoellick to Attend World Economic Forum and Informal WTO Meetings in Davos January 28-30

January 31 Zoellick to Meet With Russian Minister Gref in Zurich on WTO Accession

WASHINGTON -- U.S. Trade Representative Robert B. Zoellick will travel to Davos, Switzerland, January 28-30 to attend the World Economic Forum (WEF) and discuss with his colleagues how to sharpen the focus of the Doha Development Agenda (DDA), and keep the talks on schedule. Opening markets has been a prime goal of President Bush, and as USTR, he has made the Doha negotiations a top priority. Zoellick played a leading role in launching them in November 2001, advancing ambitious U.S. proposals in agriculture, goods, and services, and also in getting the talks back on track during 2004 by traveling over 75,000 miles to meet with over 50 colleagues.

"A successful Doha negotiation provides the best opportunity to promote global economic growth and development, particularly in the developing world. Our meetings in Davos provide a useful forum to discuss ways to take the Geneva Framework agreed upon last July, sharpen the focus, and continue to press for ambition this year as we look towards the December Ministerial in Hong Kong," Zoellick said. "Much hard work remains if we are to realize the promise of Doha. We must continue to clear away the remaining underbrush and focus on reaching ambitious and achievable benchmarks among the three core areas of agriculture, goods and services."

"While we have different negotiating positions, we know that economic openness offers the best hope for our respective peoples and we are committed to helping our countries prosper. I'm personally very proud of our shared accomplishments in the WTO and I have enjoyed working with such talented people from so many dif-

ferent countries," added Zoellick. "President Bush and the Administration remain fully committed to the Doha Development Agenda."

On Friday, January 28, Zoellick will participate in a meeting with the International Business Council and hold a number of bilateral meetings, among them with Australian Prime Minister John Howard, Israeli Foreign Minister Silvan Shalom, Indian Trade Minister Kamal Nath, and Economics and Labor Minister Wolfgang Clement of Germany.

Zoellick will participate in a WEF panel "Keeping the Global Economy Running" the morning of Saturday, January 29. He will meet bilaterally with Indonesian Trade Minister Mari Pangestu and Malaysian Deputy Prime Minister Najib Razak and in the afternoon he will join an informal session of ministers responsible for trade to discuss the Doha Development Agenda.

On Sunday, January 30 Zoellick will hold a bilateral meeting with Brazilian Foreign Minister Celso Amorim.

On Monday, January 31, Zoellick will meet in Zurich with Russian Trade Minister German Gref to review Russia's WTO accession efforts.

Background on U.S. Efforts in 2004:

In 2004, the United States pressed for action on the Doha agenda. Zoellick stated in a January letter to all WTO Ministers that 2004 should not be a lost year for Doha negotiations. The January letter also outlined ways to put the negotiations back on track, and number of ideas have been taken up by others. In February, he traveled over 32,000 miles around the world and met with over 40 counterparts to hear their views and discuss how best to get the negotiations back on track. In May, Zoellick hosted a small gathering of colleagues in London to facilitate a discussion about how to keep the Doha negotiations moving forward. He joined Ministers from the EU, India, and Australia at a gathering hosted by Brazil in Sao Paulo in early June. He also joined these colleagues at a meeting in Paris and then traveled to Mauritius on July 12 for a meeting of some of the so-called G-90, a group of ACP (African, Caribbean and Pacific), and African Union, and Least Developed Countries.

Background on U.S. Negotiating Proposals:

Within the Doha negotiations, the United States was the first WTO member to put forward a comprehensive

agricultural trade reform proposal, calling for elimination of export subsidies, cuts of \$100 billion in annual allowed global trade-distorting domestic subsidies, and lowering average allowed global tariffs from 62 percent to 15 percent. The United States also proposed that WTO members agree in this negotiation to a specific date for elimination of agricultural tariffs and trade-distorting domestic support.

The United States proposed eliminating all tariffs on consumer and industrial goods by 2015. The U.S. plan for zero tariffs is comprehensive, would benefit both developed and developing nations, and would eliminate tariffs on the over \$6 trillion in annual world goods trade, lifting the economic fortunes of workers, families, businesses, and consumers. A University of Michigan study estimates that global free trade in goods and services would raise U.S. annual income by \$500 billion as a result of tariff-free trade - contributing to higher paying jobs. The same study found gains of up to \$690 billion for the EU and EFTA together (Western Europe).

In services, the United States proposed liberalizing global trade in services by removing foreign barriers in areas such as financial services, telecom, express delivery, energy, among others. Service industries are a major component of U.S. economic activity, accounting for 80 percent of U.S. employment and 63 percent of the U.S. Gross Domestic Product (GDP). The United States also is the world's largest exporter of services. U.S. services exports have increased more than 70 percent in the last 10 years, increasing from \$199 billion in 1994 to \$340 billion in 2004 (estimated from 11 months data).

According to the World Bank, developing countries would gain nearly two-thirds of the benefit from global free trade in goods including agriculture. Their increase in annual income would amount to \$539 billion. The bank further found that free trade could help lift 300 million people out of poverty -- a number greater than the entire population of the United States.

DONORS, RECIPIENTS SHOULD DEMAND MORE AID RESULTS, OFFICIAL SAYS

Lack of measurable results stifling development, Treasury's Taylor adds

Foreign assistance donors and recipients share responsibility for demanding results linked to aid contributions, a top U.S. Treasury official says.

The lack of measurable results from aid is a main reason the world is "behind" in progress toward meeting the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), particularly in Africa, said John Taylor, under secretary for international affairs.

Taylor addressed the annual meeting of the World Economic Forum January 27 in Davos, Switzerland.

The MDGs, endorsed by 189 national leaders in 2000, seek significant improvements in hunger, education, health, gender equality and environmental sustainability. They also aim for establishment of an international trade and finance policy framework that favors development by 2015.

Taylor said a report from the Millennium Project, "Investing in Development: A Practical Plan to Achieve the Millennium Development Goals," suggests how the international community should approach the time-bound development targets and calls the private sector an essential element for development.

He said the report discusses the same considerations that persuaded the Bush administration to introduce the Millennium Challenge Account (MCA), which directs aid to poor countries that exhibit commitments to good governance, sound economic policies and investment in people.

Taylor said that the United States is increasing its official development assistance (ODA) 50 percent from 2000 to 2006. However, he said, increases in U.S. assistance will not be possible without measurable results.

Following is the text of Taylor's prepared remarks:

Statement on Getting the Millennium Development Goals Back on Track

John B. Taylor, Under Secretary for International Affairs
United States Department of the Treasury
Davos, Switzerland
January 27, 2005

Thank you for inviting me to participate in this discussion. Since we are here to talk about “getting the millennium development goals (MDGs) back on track,” the first question one must ask is why they are off track, particularly in Africa. In my view, a significant part of the answer has to do with the lack of measurable results. What gets measured gets done, and my experience has been that aid is increasingly being delivered in a way that is disconnected from the results we are trying to achieve. Donors and recipients share responsibility in this. For example, donors are engaging in budget support operations without demanding a serious effort to measure how those resources result in progress toward meeting the MDGs. On the recipient side, the Poverty Reduction Strategies -- which serve as the basis for budget support operations -- are very weak when it comes to results measurement. I have traveled to developing countries throughout the world and visited many development projects, and I am still amazed, and frankly disappointed, at the unevenness of the results measurement efforts. Getting the MDGs on track will require all of us to aim development assistance squarely at the goals themselves, and to focus on tangible results that will allow us to chart our progress.

The report from the Millennium Project, “Investing in Development: A Practical Plan to Achieve the Millennium Development Goals,” takes a serious look at the steps the international community should take to deliver on time-bound development targets. The report’s attention to an entrepreneurial private sector as an essential element for development is laudable. I am especially pleased by the forceful call for directing aid towards countries that have established a track record of governing both justly and wisely. Targeting such good performers has many merits. First, and as the report notes, quality of governance and a commitment to sound economic policies are necessary preconditions for any country that hopes to undertake and sustain the ambitious investment programs that are necessary to achieve the MDGs. In the absence of those preconditions, both donor resources as well as precious recipient country resources are likely to be wasted. A policy of targeting good performers can also provide other countries with strong incentives to

govern more justly and wisely by further increasing the economic rewards to be gained through reform.

Indeed, the considerations that underpin the report’s call for targeting “MDG fast-track countries” are precisely the same considerations that persuaded us in the U.S. to introduce the Millennium Challenge Account (MCA). The MCA is one of the only instruments in place that systematically directs aid to poor countries that, despite their economic condition, exhibit both quality of governance and a commitment to sound economic policies and investment in their people. The concessional windows of the multilateral development banks have a somewhat similar performance-based system in place; countries that rank higher on their Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) indicators receive, all else being equal, a larger allocation of funds. We have been urging the World Bank to adopt the transparency standards of the MCA in its Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) indicators so countries have clear incentives to improve and to hold the World Bank more accountable for its ratings. We have also worked to ensure that the weight of governance remains high in the calculation of those indicators. To reduce the weight of governance would reward countries like Zimbabwe at the expense of countries like Tanzania.

Regarding the relationship between aggregate aid flows and MDGs, the United States has significantly increased ODA, but we think that it is simply impossible at this point in time to forecast how much will ultimately be required and disagree with the concept of specific ODA targets. Aid is just one of many important inputs to development, and the amount of aid that will be needed to meet the MDGs will depend critically on the quantity and quality of the supply of these other inputs. Indeed, the argument for targeting good performers grows out of the recognition that aid is most effective when coupled with good governance, and sound policy.

As we increase aid to poor but well-governed countries, it is particularly important that we do not cripple them with debt in the process. Through the increased use of grant funding to these very poor countries as they work to achieve sustainable development, we can help them to break free of recurrent “lend and forgive” cycles. Such cycles are signals of poor governance on the part of donors and recipients alike, and more importantly, can act to stifle the investments that are necessary to achieve growth. I am pleased to see that the report endorses the use of grants to the poorest countries.

The report mentions the need for countries to live up to the Monterrey Consensus commitments. In fact, the U.S. committed to increase our ODA by 50 percent from 2000 to 2006 and it was already up by 60 percent through 2003. In Sub-Saharan Africa, the U.S. has more than quadrupled its aid contributions in just three years alone, from \$1.1 billion in 2000 to over \$4.6 billion in 2003.

As part of our concerted efforts to combat the specter of HIV/AIDS, the U.S. committed \$1.2 billion in bilateral assistance for 2003, or \$800 million more than the next largest donor. In FY 2004, the total U.S. budget for international HIV/AIDS programs was \$2.4 billion and the U.S. is the largest investor in the Global Fund. With the help of our development partners, the U.S. is spearheading the global effort to eradicate Polio, having committed roughly \$1 billion and now leading the way in mobilizing support for the World Health Organization's Polio Eradication Initiative.

None of these increases in assistance will be sustainable, and talk of even greater increases will be unrealistic, without measurable results. In my own experience, the best way to encourage more generosity from U.S. taxpayers is to provide them with clear evidence of results. Moving forward, we will need to present increased development assistance as a clear means towards an end rather than as an end in itself. This will require us (first) to define clear objectives for development funding and (then) to identify demonstrable results associated with those objectives. In addition to helping us persuade U.S. taxpayers, our efforts in this vein will teach us to use aid more effectively by providing the opportunity to evaluate and draw lessons from what works and what doesn't work.

STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS CONVEYS PRESIDENTIAL AGENDA, VISION

Millions expected to watch Bush deliver traditional presidential address

Washington -- President Bush is scheduled to deliver his State of the Union address on the evening of February 2 to Congress, the nation and a worldwide television and Internet audience.

The U.S. Constitution requires that the president report to Congress "from time to time" on the "State of the

Union." This constitutional requirement has evolved into the president's annual State of the Union address, which now serves several purposes. The speech reports on the condition of the United States both domestically and internationally, recommends a legislative agenda for the coming year, and gives the president the opportunity to convey personally his vision for the nation.

Bush's 2004 speech addressed a variety of domestic and international issues including the war on terrorism, U.S. involvement in Iraq and Afghanistan, homeland security, health care and education. The speech emphasized U.S. support for democracy and freedom worldwide. "America is a nation with a mission, and that mission comes from our most basic beliefs," said Bush in his 2004 address. "Our aim is a democratic peace -- a peace founded upon the dignity and rights of every man and woman," he added.

The tradition of the State of the Union address dates back to 1790 when George Washington, the first U.S. president, delivered his "Annual Message." Washington and his successor, John Adams, delivered their addresses in person surrounded by pomp and ceremony.

But the nation's third president, Thomas Jefferson, felt that such elaborate displays were not suitable for the new democratic republic. He delivered a written message rather than appearing in person. Jefferson's influence was such that for more than a century thereafter presidents delivered written Annual Messages to Congress.

In the early decades of the republic, most of these messages were lists of bills the president wanted the Congress to enact -- reflecting the tenor of the times and the practical problems involved in building the young American nation. The speeches also dealt with the international situation and America's place in the world.

During the crisis that, more than any other, threatened the very existence of the American union -- the Civil War -- Abraham Lincoln wrote perhaps the most eloquent and memorable of all presidential messages sent to Congress.

"In giving freedom to the slave, we assure freedom to the free -- honorable alike in what we give and what we preserve," wrote Lincoln in 1862.

In 1913, Woodrow Wilson revived the practice of delivering the Annual Message in person. This was a timely decision as the United States was on the eve of a mass media revolution that would soon bring presidents into

the homes of Americans, first through radio, then by television.

With the election of Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1932, Americans became accustomed to hearing their presidents on radio as well as seeing and hearing them on the newsreels at the movies.

In 1945, the Annual Message formally became known as the State of the Union address. It also became a television as well as radio staple as sales of television sets skyrocketed in the 1950s. In recognition of the power of television to deliver the president's words to a huge audience, President Lyndon Johnson shifted the time of the address from the traditional midday to evening when more viewers could watch.

The tradition of the opposition response began in 1966 when two Republican Congressmen, including future President Gerald Ford, delivered a televised Republican response to President Johnson's State of the Union address.

The broadcast of the State of the Union address on television and the wide national and international audience it attracts -- an estimated 43.4 million viewers watched Bush's 2004 address -- have changed the fundamental nature of the message, according to political observers.

"As the audience has changed from inside the Beltway [Washington, DC] to outside," says political scientist Paul C. Light, "the State of the Union has changed from a sometimes windy policy address to a major campaign event," in which the main audience is the American voter and those monitoring it overseas, rather than just American lawmakers.

This will certainly be true when President Bush delivers his State of the Union address, the first of his second term, on February 2. The 2005 address will mark the 216th Annual or State of the Union address and the 72nd delivered in person. Although there will be a major focus on domestic issues, both American and overseas observers will be listening closely to the president's words as he outlines his vision for the nation in the upcoming year and beyond.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS CENSURE SUDAN ON CONTINUED VIOLENCE IN DARFUR

Following visit to region, congressional delegation calls for sanctions

By Matthew Pritchard and Jim Fisher-Thompson
Washington File Staff Writers

Washington - Despite having signed a much-heralded North-South peace accord ending 30 years of civil war in the country, the government of Sudan is still tolerating genocide in Darfur, a delegation of U.S. lawmakers declared on returning from a visit to the region.

Within days after returning from a trip to the region, Africa Subcommittee Chairman Ed Royce (Republican of California) told a January 27 news conference, "The killing continues in Darfur," including the bombing of a Darfur village by the Sudanese government that killed 150 refugees while the delegation was still in Sudan.

"The killing goes on day in and day out" by militias supported by the Khartoum government called the Jinga-wei, he said. "We know of systematic rape. It is racial in nature."

"Last summer the House of Representatives went on record labeling the killing in Darfur as genocide. [Now] having seen Darfur, nothing changes my view," Royce declared.

Royce led a congressional delegation that visited refugee camps in Darfur and neighboring Chad January 21-26. The delegation included Representatives Jim McDermott (Democrat of Washington), Barbara Lee (Democrat of California), Diane Watson (Democrat of California), and Betty McCollum (Democrat of Minnesota).

The group was joined by African-American actor Don Cheadle, who has just been nominated for an Academy Award for his role in the film "Hotel Rwanda," which tells the story of a hotel manager in Kigali, Rwanda, who saved the lives of more than 1,000 people during the massacres in 1994 that took more than 800,000 lives.

"In Rwanda small acts could have made a big difference," Royce said. In order to avoid a repeat of what happened in Rwanda, Royce declared, "international pressure must be put on Khartoum" to stop the killing.

Above all, Royce added, Russia, which sells arms to Sudan and China -- both members of the U.N. Security Council -- must make the effort to put pressure on the Sudanese government.

In an equally blunt assessment, Jim McDermott said, "The Sudanese government is committing genocide and they won't stop unless there is a global effort to stop them."

It is imperative that the United States and its allies maintain constant pressure on the Sudanese government to end the genocide in Darfur, the lawmaker said.

"This is not a situation where we need to get in there and start another front of a [global] war," he said. "This should be stopped right in the capital of Khartoum. They can stop it by telling their troops, 'Stop it.'"

Congresswoman Barbara Lee spoke forcefully about the effects of the genocide she witnessed in Darfur. "I saw the missing limbs," she said. "I looked in the eyes of the girls who had been raped. The sheer force of the human suffering we witnessed has strengthened my conviction that we must take action to end the ongoing genocide in Darfur."

She suggested that both China and Pakistan, which have oil interests in the region, must make efforts to stop the genocide.

"We need a strong U.N. resolution, backed by sanctions, and we must provide the resources and logistical support necessary for the peacekeeping force to do its job effectively," she said.

One action Lee proposes is to divest money from companies that do business with the Sudanese government. In December 2004, one of the largest state pension funds in the country, the California Public Employees Retirement System (CalPERS), agreed to look into whether they invest in any companies doing business with the government in Khartoum, and encourage the companies to end their business with the government.

Congresswoman Diane Watson said she recently met with President Bush, with National Security Advisor (now Secretary of State) Condoleezza Rice, and then with the Congressional Black Caucus, and informed them of the continuing genocide in Darfur. She asked Rice if she would lead a delegation, to which, she said, Rice had nodded she would.

Watson also said the press holds a very important role in informing the world of what's happening in the region and expressed her disappointment over the limited coverage of the crisis in the American media, noting the failure of her own hometown paper, the Los Angeles Times, to cover even this press conference.

Cheadle added that everyone from the press, to governments, to people all over the world can make a difference to help save the people of Darfur. "The human spirit is amazing and it can overcome," he said, "but it can also be stamped out if it is not supported and helped."

RICE BEGINS TENURE AT STATE, AFFIRMS BUSH AGENDA

Calls on State Department to lead efforts to spread freedom, liberty

Describing the current era as "a great time" for the United States and the international system, newly sworn-in Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice told State Department employees she intends to press forward President Bush's agenda for "a freer and more prosperous world."

"We have allies who we need to unite in this great cause ahead of us" and "we have to make it so that we work with those who want to achieve those aspirations," Rice said January 27.

Comparing the current democratization of the Middle East to that of Germany and Japan after World War II, Rice said, "I can't think of a better call than to say that America will stand for freedom and for liberty."

Just as the United States now sits with democratic leaders in both those countries, the United States must aspire to work with democratic leaders in the Middle East. "That's our charge. That's our calling," she said.

"I know that there are those who wonder whether democracy can take hold in the rocky soil of the West Bank or in Iraq or in Afghanistan," she said. "I believe that we, as Americans, who know how hard the path to democracy is, have to believe that it can."

A biography of Rice is available at http://usinfo.state.gov/is/Archive/intsec_rice.html

Following is the transcript of Secretary Rice's remarks:

January 27, 2005
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE
C Street Lobby
Washington, D.C.

SECRETARY RICE: (Applause.) Thank you very much. Thank you. Well, this is a little different welcome than the first time that I came to work at the State Department. Now, that may surprise some of you, but I was, in 1977, an intern in the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. (Laughter and applause.) Now, there's a lesson in that: Be good to your interns. (Laughter.)

I want to thank you for this really, really warm welcome. I first want to start by just saying how much I admire and appreciate the leadership of Secretary Colin Powell over the last four years. I've just spoken with him to tell him that. (Applause.)

We've got a lot of challenges ahead of us. This is a really remarkable time in our country's history. The President has set forth a really bold agenda for American foreign policy and the State Department has got to be in the lead in this period in which diplomacy will be so important to solidifying the gains of the last few years and to pressing forward an agenda for a freer and more prosperous world. I can't think of a better call than to say that America will stand for freedom and for liberty, that America will stand with those who want their aspirations met for liberty and freedom. And I'm going to look and the President's going to look to this Department to lead that effort, and not just to implement policy, but we're going to need ideas, intellectual capital. I need your ideas. My door will be open. Please, understand that this is a time when the history is calling us. And I just look forward to working with each and every one of you toward that end.

The President has laid out a bold agenda and he expects a lot of us. I want you to know, too, that I'm going to be committed to you, the men and women of the Foreign Service, the Civil Service and our Foreign Service Nationals abroad; and you, in turn, will be committed, and we, in turn, will be committed, to carrying out that bold agenda.

I know that this is a profession that demands a lot. It demands a lot from your families, it demands a lot from you, and sometimes it demands the ultimate sacrifice. And I want to start by recognizing that I know that there

are memorial plaques here in this hall that commemorate those who have made the ultimate sacrifice, and we'll always remember what they did for this country as we go about trying to carry out this extraordinary agenda before us.

I want you to know, too, that I will be committed to making certain that we have the tools that we need to carry out this agenda. I believe in training and I believe in education, continuing education, of this diplomatic corps. And I hope to see over the next several years an even more diverse diplomatic corps, because one of the wonderful things about America is that we are one America made up of people from all backgrounds and all ethnicities and all religions. It's an extraordinary thing that we really have forged one out of many, and we are going to be a diplomatic corps that embodies that diversity, because it's an extremely important lesson in a world where difference is still a license to kill.

This is a great time for America. It's a great time for the international system. We have allies who we need to unite in this great cause ahead of us, and I look forward to working with you to do that.

Now, I want to close with a kind of personal recollection as I start here, and that is that the last time I was in government was actually 1989 to 1991. And that, too, was an extraordinary time. I was lucky enough to be the White House Soviet Specialist at the end of the Cold War. It doesn't get much better than that. And I got to participate in German unification and the liberation of Eastern Europe and the peaceful collapse of the Soviet Union.

But, you know, I realized that I was just harvesting good decisions that had been made in 1946 and 1947 and 1948, a lot of those decisions spurred by good work done by this building, the men and women of the State Department. And those were days when it must have seemed that freedom's march was not assured. You think about it. In 1947, civil wars in Greece and Turkey; and in 1948, the permanent division of Germany, thanks to the Berlin crisis; and in 1949, the Soviet Union explodes a nuclear weapon five years ahead of schedule and the Chinese communists win.

It must not have looked like freedom's march was assured, but they somehow pulled themselves together, people like Truman and Acheson and Marshall and, of course, on Capitol Hill, Senator Vandenberg. And they created a policy and a set of institutions that gave us a

lasting peace. While no one might have been able, at that time, to imagine a democratic Germany or a democratic Japan, when President Bush now sits across from Chancellor Schroeder or from Prime Minister Koizumi, he sits across not just from a friend, but a democratic friend.

I know that there are those who wonder whether democracy can take hold in the rocky soil of the West Bank or in Iraq or in Afghanistan. I believe that we, as Americans, who know how hard the path to democracy is, have to believe that it can. And we have to make it so that we work with those who want to achieve those aspirations so that, one day, a future President is sitting across from the democratic president or prime minister of many a Middle Eastern country, of many a country that has not yet known democracy.

That's our charge. That's our calling. I know that you will work hard on behalf of it and so will I. And now, I'll go try to find my office, if you don't mind. Thank you. (Laughter.)